ORIGINAL

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATIO

RECEIVED

7013 MAY 23 P 3: 28

SOCKET CONTROL

DORP COMMISSION

BOB STUMP

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

CHAIRMAN

GARY PIERCE

COMMISSIONER

4 | BRENDA BURNS

COMMISSIONER

BOB BURNS

COMMISSIONER

SUSAN BITTER SMITH

COMMISSIONER

0000145106

Docket No. W-01445A-12-0348

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF ARIZONA WATER COMPANY, AN ARIZONA CORPORATION, FOR A DETERMINATION OF THE FAIR VALUE OF ITS UTILITY PLANT AND PROPERTY, **AND ADJUSTMENTS** TO ITS RATES AND **CHARGES FOR** UTILITY **SERVICE** FURNISHED BY ITS NORTHERN GROUP AND FOR CERTAIN RELATED APPROVALS.

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

MAY 2 3 2013

DOGKETED BY

RUCO'S NOTICE OF FILING

The RESIDENTIAL UTILITY CONSUMER OFFICE ("RUCO") hereby files its response to the request for language that RUCO believes would remove the legal impediment related to the SIB. RUCO has worked diligently to finalize the "magical wording" which RUCO believes will resolve the legal issues with the SIB. The focus of RUCO's attempts has been a mini-style rate case in which the Company submits an application which includes an analysis of all the rate case elements in an abbreviated format and an abbreviated procedure. There are many challenges in developing a viable format but one that is of particular note is matching the rate case elements. In order for each new revenue increase to make sense and be fair and reasonable there would have to be some connection between the test year and the year the new plant is actually put in

2

1

3

5 6

7

9

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

service. That connection becomes even more tenuous over time as the annual filings get farther and farther away from the rate case test year.

RUCO has been unable to put a format together which it would feel comfortable with. That is not to say it could not be done – just that RUCO has not been able to do it yet. The SIB is only one of RUCO's objections to the settlement, but if there is language and a method that can resolve the legal issue and there are adequate financial benefits to the ratepayer to offset the obvious benefits to the shareholder RUCO would consider withdrawing its objection to the SIB.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 23rd day of May, 2013.

Daniel Pozefsky Chief Counsel

AN ORIGINAL AND THIRTEEN COPIES of the foregoing filed this 23rd day of May, 2013 with:

Docket Control
Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 West Washington
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

COPIES of the foregoing hand delivered/ mailed this 23rd day of May, 2013 to:

Sarah Harpring
Administrative Law Judge
Hearing Division
Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 West Washington
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Janice Alward, Chief Counsel Wesley Van Cleave Legal Division Arizona Corporation Commission 1200 West Washington Phoenix, Arizona 85007

| 1 | Steven M. Olea, Director Utilities Division |
|----|---|
| 2 | Arizona Corporation Commission 1200 West Washington |
| 3 | Phoenix, Arizona 85007 |
| 4 | Steven A. Hirsch Stanley B. Lutz |
| 5 | Bryan Cave LLP Two North Central Avenue, Suite 2200 |
| 6 | Phoenix, AZ 85004 |
| 7 | |
| 8 | By Chery Frauloh |
| 9 | Cheryl Fraulob |
| 10 | |
| 11 | • |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |